arXiv:1605.06985v1 [math.CV] 23 May 2016

ZERO SETS OF FUNCTIONS IN THE NEVANLINNA CLASS AND THE $\bar{\partial}_b$-EQUATION ON CONVEX DOMAINS OF GENERAL TYPE IN $\mathbb{C}^2$

TRAN VU KHANH AND ANDREW RAICH

Abstract. The purpose of this paper is to characterize the zero sets of holomorphic functions in the Nevanlinna class on a class of convex domains of infinite type in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Moreover, we also obtain L^p estimates, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, for a particular solution of the tangential Cauchy-Riemann equation on the boundaries of these domains.

1. Introduction

1.1. **Background.** Let Ω be a C^∞-smooth, bounded domain with smooth defining function ρ. In several complex variables, characterizing the zero sets of holomorphic functions in the Nevanlinna class is closely related to the Poincaré-Lelong equation

$$i\partial\bar{\partial}u = \alpha \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

for d-closed, smooth $(1,1)$-forms α. Not surprisingly, solving the Poincaré-Lelong equation with estimates often amounts to studying the Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\bar{\partial}u = f \quad \text{on } \Omega$$

where f is a $\bar{\partial}$-closed $(0,1)$-form on f. For investigating the Nevanlinna class, the type of estimates that are useful are solutions u with boundary values in $L^1(b\Omega)$. The techinque that we use to solve the boundary value estimate in turn yields a solution to the tangential Cauchy-Riemann equation

$$\bar{\partial}_b u = f$$

in $L^p(b\Omega)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ where f is $\bar{\partial}_b$-closed $(0,1)$. In fact, our technique is produces a gain in L^∞ and maps L^∞ to an appropriate f-Hölder space. Therefore, our results concern the related problems of complex varieties that are zero sets of Nevanlinna functions, the Cauchy-Riemann, and tangential Cauchy-Riemann equations.

It is well-known that if $h \in N(\Omega)$ then the zero divisor X_h of h satisfies the Blaschke condition. Whether or not the converse is true, namely, *"If $h \in H(\Omega)$ and X_h satisfies the Blaschke condition, does there exists $f \in N(\Omega)$ so that $X_f = X_h$?"* has been extensively studied over the past forty years. The $n = 1$ case is a classic one-variable result in the complex plane. In contrast, for $n \geq 2$, the Blaschke condition for a divisor no longer suffices to be the zero set of a Nevanlinna function or even the zero set of an H^p function [Var80]. There are cases, however, where the Blaschke condition is sufficient. Namely, the sufficiency is known when Ω is

- a strongly pseudoconvex domain [Gru75, Sko76];
- a pseudoconvex domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$ of finite type [CNS92, Sha89];
- a complex or real ellipsoid by [BC82, Sha91];

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32F20; 32F10; 32T25; 32N15.

Key words and phrases. Cauchy-Riemann equation, infinite type, tangential Cauchy-Riemann equation, Nevanlinna class, Henkin solution, general Hölder space, L^p regularity.

The first author was partially supported by Australian Research Council DE160100173. The second author was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1405100. He also gratefully acknowledges the support provided by Wolfson College at the University of Cambridge during his Fellowship year there.

- a convex domain of strictly finite type and/or finite type [BCD98, CDM14, Cum01, DM01].

Furthermore, the positive answer still holds on the following infinite type example:

$$D_\alpha = \left\{(z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : |z_1|^2 + \exp\left(1 + \frac{2}{\alpha} - \frac{1}{|z_2|^\alpha}\right) < 1\right\} \tag{1.1}$$

with $0 < \alpha < 1$ (see [AC02]).

In this paper, we shall prove the converse is true for the class of convex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ of general type by Khanh in [Kha13, HKR14]. All known examples of convex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ are covered by our class.

Establishing L^p and Hölder estimates for solutions of the $\bar{\partial}_b$-equation is a fundamental question in several complex variables. It has been extensively investigated on classes of domains of finite type such as strongly pseudoconvex domains [FS74, Hen77a, Hen77b], convex domains [Ale05, Sha91], domains with a diagonalizable Levi form [FKM90], domains where the Levi form has comparable eigenvalues [Koe02], decoupled domains [NS06], and pseudoconvex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$ [Chr88, FK88]. See also [Wu98, LTS05]. Theorem 3 provides the first example of L^p, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, and Hölder estimates on an infinite type domain.

1.2. **The class of general type convex domains.** Our setup is the following: $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^2$ is a smooth, bounded domain. For each $p \in b\Omega$, the curvature of $b\Omega$ at p is captured by local coordinates $z_p = T_p(z)$ where T_p is a $\mathbb{C}$-linear transformation that sends p to the origin. Additionally, there exist a global defining function ρ and functions F_p and r_p satisfying

$$\Omega_p = T_p(\Omega) = \{z_p = (z_{p,1}, z_{p,2}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho(T_p^{-1}(z_p)) = F_p(|z_{p,1}|^2) + r_p(z_p) < 0\} \tag{1.2}$$

or

$$\Omega_p = T_p(\Omega) = \{z_p = (z_{p,1}, z_{p,2}) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho(T_p^{-1}(z_p)) = F_p(x_{p,1}^2) + r_p(z_p) < 0\} \tag{1.3}$$

where $z_{p,j} = x_{p,j} + iy_{p,j}$, $x_{p,j}, y_{p,j} \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, 2$, and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. We also require that the functions $F_p : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ and $r_p : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy:

i. $F_p(0) = 0$;

ii. $F_p'(t), F_p''(t), F_p'''(t)$, and $\left(\dfrac{F_p(t)}{t}\right)'$ are nonnegative on $[0, \tilde{d}_p^2)$ for some $\tilde{d}_p > d_p$;

iii. $r_p(0) = 0$ and $\dfrac{\partial r_p}{\partial z_{p,2}} \neq 0$ on $b\Omega$ with $|z_{1,p}| \leq \delta$;

iv. r_p is convex,

where d_p is the diameter of Ω_p and δ is a small number independent of p.

This class of domains includes several well-known examples. If Ω is of finite type $2m$, then $F_p(t) = t^m$ at the points of type $2m$. On the other hand, if $F_p(t) = \exp(-1/t^\alpha)$, then Ω is of infinite type at p, and this is our main case of interest. Our hypotheses include the following three classes of infinite type domains: the complex ellipsoid

$$\Omega = \left\{z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \sum_{j=1}^{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|z_j|^{\alpha_j}}\right) \leq e^{-1}\right\}; \tag{1.4}$$

the real ellipsoid

$$\Omega = \left\{z = (x_1 + iy_1, x_2 + iy_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \sum_{j=1}^{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|x_j|^{\alpha_j}}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|y_j|^{\beta_j}}\right) \leq e^{-1}\right\}; \tag{1.5}$$

and the mixed case

$$\Omega = \left\{ z = (x_1 + iy_1, x_2 + iy_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|x_1|^{\alpha_1}}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|y_1|^{\beta_1}}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{1}{|z_2|^{\alpha_2}}\right) \leq e^{-1} \right\} \quad (1.6)$$

where $\alpha_j, \beta_j > 0$. Moreover, our setting also includes a tube domain of infinite type at 0

$$\Omega = \{ z = (x_1 + iy_1, x_2 + iy_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \exp\left(1 - \frac{1}{|x_1|^{\alpha_1}}\right) + \chi(y_1) + |z_2|^2 \leq 1 \} \quad (1.7)$$

where χ is a convex function and $\chi(y_1) = 0$ when $|y_1| < \delta$ and $\alpha_1 > 0$ for $j = 1, 2$.

1.3. **Notation.** For an excellent discussion of the Nevanlinna class, complex varieties, (positive) currents, and (irreducible) divisors, we strongly encourage the reader to consult Range [Ran86] and Noguchi and Ochiai [NO90].

The *Nevanlinna class* for Ω, denoted by $N(\Omega)$, is defined by

$$N(\Omega) = \left\{ h \in H(\Omega) : \sup_{\epsilon > 0} \int_{b\Omega_\epsilon} |\log |h(z)|| \, d\sigma_{b\Omega_\epsilon}(z) < +\infty \right\},$$

where $H(\Omega)$ is the space of holomorphic functions on Ω, $b\Omega_\epsilon = \{z : \rho(z) = -\epsilon\}$ for small $\epsilon > 0$, and $d\sigma_{b\Omega_\epsilon}(z)$ denotes the Euclidean surface measure on $b\Omega\epsilon$. If $X \subset \Omega$ is a complex variety with irreducible decomposition

$$X = \bigcup_k X_k$$

and $n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ are positive integers for each k, the divisor $\hat{X} := \{X_k, n_k\}$ is said to satisfy the *Blaschke condition* if

$$\sum_k n_k \int_{X_k} |\rho(z)| d\mu_{X_k}(z) < \infty$$

where $d\mu_{X_k}$ is the induced surface area measure on X_k.

1.4. **Main results.** We have three main results.

Theorem 1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^2$. Assume that for any $p \in b\Omega$*

i. Ω is defined by (1.2) and $\int_0^{d_p} |\log F_p(t^2)| \, dt < \infty$ for all $p \in b\Omega$, or

ii. Ω is defined by (1.3) and $\int_0^{d_p} |\log(t) \log F_p(t^2)| \, dt < \infty$ for all $p \in b\Omega$.

Then for any divisors $\hat{X}$ in Ω satisfying the Blaschke condition there is a function $h \in N(\Omega)$ such that $\hat{X}$ is the zero divisor of h.

To apply Theorem 1 to the domains Ω defined by any of (1.4) - (1.7), we are forced to require that $\alpha_j < 1$, though any $\beta_j > 0$ is permissible. The crucial step to prove Theorem 1 is the existence a solution of the $\bar{\partial}$-equation that satisfies both of the following conditions: the solution is (i) smooth if data is smooth, and (ii) bounded in $L^1(b\Omega)$.

Theorem 2. *Let Ω be a domain satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Then for any $\bar{\partial}$-closed, smooth $(0,1)$-form ϕ on Ω so that $\|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} < \infty$, there exists a smooth function u such that*

$$\bar{\partial} u = \phi \quad \text{on } \Omega \quad (1.8)$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \leq c \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \quad (1.9)$$

where $c > 0$ is independent of ϕ.

Remark 1. The constant c in (1.9) depends on the geometric type and diameter of Ω. It is, however, uniformly bounded if Ω satisfies the hypothesis of Theorem 1 and diameter of Ω is bounded.

Let u be the Henkin solution to (1.8) given by (2.18) below. Then the smoothness of u, given the smoothness of ϕ, is a consequence of Theorem 3 in [Ran92]. Therefore we only need to prove that the inequality (1.9) holds for this u. The proof will be given in Section 2. A small modification of the technique to prove (1.9) yields L^p-estimates for the tangential Cauchy-Riemann equation, a significant and new result in its own right.

Theorem 3. *Let Ω be a domain satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1 and $p \in [1, \infty]$. Let ϕ be a $(0,1)$-form in $L^p(b\Omega)$, satisfying the compatibility condition $\int_{b\Omega} \phi \wedge \alpha = 0$ for every continuous up the boundary, $\bar{\partial}$-closed $(2,0)$-form α on Ω. Then there exists a function u on $b\Omega$ such that*

$$\bar{\partial}_b u = \phi \quad \text{on } b\Omega \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\|u\|_{L^p(b\Omega)} \leq c\|\phi\|_{L^p(b\Omega)} \tag{1.11}$$

where $c > 0$ is independent of ϕ.

Moreover, in the case $p = \infty$, we obtain a "gain" for the solution of $\bar{\partial}_b$ into the f-Hölder spaces, that is,

$$\|u\|_{\Lambda^f(b\Omega)} \leq c\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)}. \tag{1.12}$$

The function f is defined by $f(d^{-1}) := \inf_{p \in b\Omega} \left(\int_0^d \frac{\sqrt{F_p^*(t)}}{t} dt \right)^{-1}$ when Ω is defined by (1.2) and by $f(d^{-1}) := \inf_{p \in b\Omega} \left(\int_0^d \frac{\sqrt{F_p^*(t)} |\log \sqrt{F^*(t)}|}{t} dt \right)^{-1}$ when Ω is defined by (1.3). Here the superscript * denotes the inverse function and the f-Hölder space Λ^f is defined by

$$\Lambda^f(b\Omega) = \left\{ u : ||u||_{\Lambda^f(b\Omega)} := ||u||_{L^\infty(b\Omega)} + \sup_{X(t) \in \mathfrak{C}, 0 \leq t \leq 1} \{ f(|t|^{-1}) |u(X(t)) - u(X(0))| \} < \infty \right\} \tag{1.13}$$

where $\mathfrak{C} = \{X(t) : t \in [0,1] \to X(t) \in b\Omega$ is C^1 and $|X'(t)| \leq 1\}$.

2. Proof of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3

We first assume that the origin is in $b\Omega$, the functions $F = F_0$ and $r = r_0$ satisfy conditions (i)-(iv) from Section 1, and

$$\Omega = \{z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho(z) = F(|z_1|^2) + r(z) < 0\} \tag{2.1}$$

or

$$\Omega = \{z = (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 : \rho(z) = F(|x_1|^2) + r(z) < 0\} \tag{2.2}$$

where $z_j = x_j + iy_j$, $x_j, y_j \in \mathbb{R}$, $j = 1, 2$. Here we only need to consider $F'(t^2) \neq 0$, for otherwise Ω is strictly convex, and the proof of Theorem 2 and 3 is known. Let the support function for Ω be defined by

$$\Phi(\zeta, z) = \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{\partial \rho(\zeta)}{\partial \zeta_j} (\zeta_j - z_j).$$

We are going to estimate $\mathrm{Re}\{\Phi(\zeta, z)\}$ for ζ, z in a neighborhood of $b\Omega$.

Setting 1: Ω is defined by (2.1). The convexity of r yields that

$$2\,\mathrm{Re}\{\Phi(\zeta, z)\} \geq \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F'(|\zeta_1|^2)|z_1 - \zeta_1|^2 + \Big[F(|z_1|^2) - F(|\zeta_1|^2) - F'(|\zeta_1|^2)(|z_1|^2 - |\zeta_1|^2) \Big] \tag{2.3}$$

for any ζ, z in a neighborhood of $b\Omega$.

Lemma 4. *Let Ω be defined by (2.1) and F satisfy both conditions (i)-(iv) from Section 1 and $F'(0) = 0$. Let ζ, z be in a neighborhood of $b\Omega$ and satisfy $\rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) \geq 0$.*

- *If $|\zeta_1| \geq |z_1 - \zeta_1|$ then*

$$|\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim \big[|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(|z_1 - \zeta_1|^2)\big]^k |z_1 - \zeta_1|.$$

- *Otherwise, if $|\zeta_1| \leq |z_1 - \zeta_1|$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim & \big[|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(\frac{1}{2}|\zeta_1|^2)\big]^k |\zeta_1| \\ & + \big[|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2)\big]^k |z_1| \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

for $k = 1, 2$.

Proof. The term in $[\cdots]$ in (2.3) is nonnegative for any ζ, z near $b\Omega$, so the hypothesis on the sizes of $|\zeta_1|$ and $|z_1 - \zeta_1|$ allow us to obtain

$$|\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim \begin{cases} (|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(|z_1 - \zeta_1|^2))^k |z_1 - \zeta_1| & \text{if } \ |\zeta_1| \geq |z_1 - \zeta_1|, \\ (|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(|\zeta_1|^2))^k |\zeta_1|. & \text{if } \ |\zeta_1| \leq |z_1 - \zeta_1|. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

The remaining estimate to show is

$$|\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim (|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2))^k |z_1| \tag{2.6}$$

in the case $|\zeta_1| \leq |z_1 - \zeta_1|$. It can be obtained using the argument of Lemma 3.2 in [HKR14]. For the reader's convenience, we outline the proof here. Start by comparing the relative sizes of $|\zeta_1|$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|z_1|$. If $|\zeta_1| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|z_1|$, then the argument follows from the second line of (2.5). Otherwise, $|\zeta_1| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|z_1|$, and this inequality implies both $|z_1| \geq |\zeta_1|$ and $|z_1 - \zeta_1| \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})|z_1|$. We then estimate the $[\dots]$ in (2.3) by

$$[\dots] := F(|z_1|^2) - F(|\zeta_1|^2) - F'(|\zeta_1|^2)(|z_1|^2 - |\zeta_1|^2) \geq F(|z_1|^2 - |\zeta_1|^2) \geq F(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2), \tag{2.7}$$

where the inequality uses the facts that $F'(0) = 0$ and F'' is nondecreasing (see [FLZ11, Lemma 4] or [HKR14, Lemma 3.1] for details). This completes the proof. □

Setting 2: Ω is defined by (2.2). An argument analogous to that of Lemma 4 produces the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let Ω be defined by (2.2) and F satisfy both conditions (i)-(iv) from Section 1 and $F'(0) = 0$. Suppose ζ, z are in a neighborhood of $b\Omega$ and $\rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) \geq 0$.*

- *If $|\xi_1| \geq |x_1 - \xi_1|$, then*

$$|\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim |\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(|x_1 - \xi_1|^2))^k (|x_1 - \xi_1| + |y_1 - \eta_1|).$$

- *Otherwise, if $|\xi_1| \leq |x_1 - \xi_1|$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi(\zeta, z)|^k |z - \zeta| \gtrsim & (|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(\frac{1}{2}|\xi_1|^2))^k (|\xi_1| + |y_1 - \eta_1|) \\ & + (|\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + \rho(\zeta) - \rho(z) + F(\frac{1}{2}|x_1|^2))^k (|x_1| + |y_1 - \eta_1|) \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

for $k = 1, 2$, where $z_1 = x_1 + iy_1$ and $\zeta_1 = \xi_1 + i\eta_1$.

Both the proofs of Theorem 2 and 3 use the supporting function estimates of Lemma 4 and 5. We first give the full proof of Theorem 3 since it is more dedicate and indicate the changes necessary to prove Theorem 2.

2.1. **Proof of Theorem 3.**

Proof of Theorem 3. Let ϕ be a $(0,1)$-form satisfying the compatibility condition, that is, $\int_{b\Omega}\phi\wedge\alpha = 0$ for every continuous up to the boundary $\bar\partial$-closed $(2,0)$-form α on Ω. M.C. Shaw [Sha91, Sha89] showed that

$$u := T_b\phi = H^+\phi - H^-\phi \tag{2.9}$$

is an integral solution (in the distribution sense) to the $\bar\partial_b$-equation, $\bar\partial_b u = \phi$, on $b\Omega$ where

$$H^+\phi(z) := \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}\int_{b\Omega} H(\zeta, z-\epsilon\nu(z))\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta), \qquad H^-\phi(z) := \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0^+}\int_{b\Omega} H(z+\epsilon\nu(z),\zeta)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta).$$

Here $\nu(z)$ is the outward unit normal vector at $z\in b\Omega$; $\omega(\zeta) = d\zeta_1\wedge d\zeta_2$; and $H(\zeta,z)$ is given by

$$H(\zeta,z) = \frac{\frac{\partial\rho(\zeta)}{\partial\zeta_1}(\bar\zeta_2-\bar z_2) - \frac{\partial\rho(\zeta)}{\partial\zeta_2}(\bar\zeta_1-\bar z_1)}{\Phi(\zeta,z)|\zeta-z|^2}. \tag{2.10}$$

In order to prove (1.11), we will prove that $\|u\|_{L^p(b\Omega)}\lesssim\|\phi\|_{L^p(b\Omega)}$ only for $p=1$ and $p=\infty$; then using Riesz-Thorin Interpolation Theorem we obtain L^p estimates for all $p\in[1,\infty]$.

Part I: Proof of $\|u\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}\lesssim\|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}$. Denote by

$$u_\epsilon(z) := \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_{b\Omega} H(\zeta, z-\epsilon\nu(z))\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta) - \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_{b\Omega} H(z+\epsilon\nu(z),\zeta)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta), \quad z\in b\Omega.$$

It follows that $\lim_{\epsilon\to0^+}u_\epsilon = u$ a.e. For $\phi\in L^1(b\Omega)$ and we need to prove that $\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}\le\|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}$ uniformly for small $\epsilon>0$. It then follows that $u_\epsilon\to u$ in $L^1(b\Omega)$ by the Dominated Convergence Theorem. We observe

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} =& \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_{z\in b\Omega}\left|\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}\left(H(\zeta,z-\epsilon\nu(z)-H(z+\epsilon\nu(z),\zeta)\right)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta)\right| dS(z)\\
\lesssim& \int_{z\in b\Omega}\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}|H(\zeta,z-\epsilon\nu(z))||\phi(\zeta)|dS(\zeta)dS(z) + \int_{z\in b\Omega}\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}|H(z-\epsilon\nu(z),\zeta)||\phi(\zeta)|dS(\zeta)dS(z)\\
\lesssim& \int_{z\in b\Omega_\epsilon}\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}|H(\zeta,z)||\phi(\zeta)|dS(\zeta)dS(z) + \int_{z\in b\Omega^\epsilon}\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}|H(z,\zeta)||\phi(\zeta)|dS(\zeta)dS(z)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\Omega_\epsilon = \{z\in\Omega : \rho(z)<-\epsilon\}$ and $\Omega^\epsilon = \{z\in\mathbb{C}^2\setminus\bar\Omega : \rho(z)>\epsilon\}$. As a consequence of Tonelli's Theorem, it suffices to prove that

$$\iint_{(\zeta,z)\in b\Omega\times b\Omega_\epsilon}\left|H(\zeta,z)||\phi(\zeta)\right| dS(\zeta,z) + \iint_{(z,\zeta)\in b\Omega^\epsilon\times b\Omega}\left|H(z,\zeta)||\phi(\zeta)\right| dS(z,\zeta)\lesssim\|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}<\infty. \tag{2.11}$$

Since $b\Omega$ is compact, for any $\delta>0$, there exist points $p_1,\dots,p_N\in b\Omega$ so that $b\Omega$ is covered by$\{B(p_j,\delta)\}_{j=1}^N$. After changing coordinates with the linear transformation T_{p_j} as in Section 1

(keeping in mind $T_{p_j}(p_j) = 0$), we may assume the goal is to prove

$$\underbrace{\iint_{(\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j}) \in (B(0,\delta) \cap (b\Omega_{p_j})_\epsilon) \times b\Omega_{p_j}} \left| H\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j}), T_{p_j}^{-1}(z_{p_j})\big) \right| \left| \phi\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j})\big) \right| dS(\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j})}_{I}$$

$$+ \underbrace{\iint_{(z_{p_j}, \zeta_{p_j}) \in b\Omega_{p_j}^\epsilon \times (B(0,\delta) \cap b\Omega_{p_j})} \left| H\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(z_{p_j}), T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j})\big) \right| \left| \phi\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j})\big) \right| dS(\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j})}_{II} \tag{2.12}$$

$$\lesssim \left\| \phi\left(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\cdot)\right) \right\|_{L^1(b\Omega_{p_j})} \approx \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)},$$

where

$$\Omega_{p_j} = \{\rho_{p_j}(z_{p_j}) := \rho\left(T_{p_j}^{-1}(z_{p_j})\right) = P_{p_j}(z_{p_j,1}) + r_{p_j}(z_{p_j}) < 0\}$$

and $P_{p_j}(z_{p_j,1}) = F_{p_j}(|z_{p_j,1}|^2)$ or $P(z_{p_j,1}) = F(x_{p_j,1}^2)$ as in Section 1. Although the integrals in (2.12) do not cover the full boundaries, the estimate on the complement is trivial because H and is derivatives are uniformly bounded. Next, note that

$$\Phi\left(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j}), T_{p_j}^{-1}(z_{p_j})\right) = \Phi_{p_j}(\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j}),$$

where Φ_{p_j} is the support function of Ω_{p_j}, and we can therefore estimate

$$\left| H\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\zeta_{p_j}), T_{p_j}^{-1}(z_{p_j})\big) \right| \lesssim \frac{1}{|\Phi_{p_j}(\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j})||\zeta_{p_j} - z_{p_j}|} \tag{2.13}$$

for any $\zeta_{p_j}, z_{p_j} \in b\Omega$. Nearby each point p_j, we will consider domains Ω_{p_j} defined by either (1.2) or (1.3). Here and in what follows, we abuse notation slightly and omit the subscript p_j as well as writing $\phi(\cdot)$ for $\phi\big(T_{p_j}^{-1}(\cdot)\big)$.

Setting 1: Ω is defined by (1.2)**.** We start our estimate of (I) from (2.12) by decomposing the domain of integration and applying Lemma 4 with $k = 1$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)) \times b\Omega_\epsilon} \cdots \\ &= \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)) \times b\Omega\epsilon \text{ and } |\zeta_1| \geq |z_1 - \zeta_1|} \cdots \\ &\quad + \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)) \times b\Omega\epsilon, |\zeta_1| \leq |z_1 - \zeta_1| \text{ and } |z_1| \leq 2\delta} \cdots + \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)) \times b\Omega_\epsilon, |\zeta_1| \leq |z_1 - \zeta_1| \text{ and } |z_1| \geq 2\delta} \cdots \\ &\lesssim (A) + (B) + (C), \end{aligned} \tag{2.14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (A) &:= \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (B(0,2\delta) \cap b\Omega) \times (B(0,2\delta) \cap b\Omega_\epsilon)} \frac{|\phi(\zeta)| dS(\zeta, z)}{(\epsilon + |\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + F(|z_1 - \zeta_1|^2))|z_1 - \zeta_1|}; \\ (B) &:= \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (B(0,2\delta) \cap b\Omega) \times (B(0,2\delta) \cap b\Omega_\epsilon)} \frac{|\phi(\zeta)| dS(\zeta, z)}{(\epsilon + |\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + F(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2))|z_1|}; \\ (C) &:= \iint_{(\zeta,z) \in (B(0,\delta) \cap b\Omega) \times b\Omega_\epsilon \text{ and } |z_1| \geq 2\delta} \frac{|\phi(\zeta)| dS(\zeta, z)}{(\epsilon + |\operatorname{Im} \Phi(\zeta, z)| + F(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2))|z_1|}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

F is increasing, so it easily follows that $(C) \lesssim (F(2\delta^2)\delta)^{-1}\|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}$. For (A), we make the change of variables $(\alpha, w) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, w_1, w_2) = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, z_1 - \zeta_1, \rho(z) + i\,\mathrm{Im}\,\Phi(\zeta, z))$. A direct calculation then establishes that if δ is chosen sufficiently small then the Jacobian of this transform does not vanish on the domain of integration. Since Φ is smooth, we can assume that there exists $\delta' > 0$ that depends on Ω, δ, and ρ so that if integrate w_1 in polar coordinates,

$$\begin{aligned}(A) &\lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \int_0^{\delta'} \int_0^{\delta'} \frac{r}{(|\,\mathrm{Im}\, w_2| + F(r^2))r}\, dr\, d\,\mathrm{Im}\, w_2 \\ &\lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \int_0^{\delta'} \log F(r^2)\, dr < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

That the integral is finite follows by the hypotheses on ϕ and F.

Repeating this argument with the change of variables $(\alpha, w) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, w_1, w_2) = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} z_1, \rho(z) + i\,\mathrm{Im}\,\Phi(\zeta, z))$ for the integral (B), we can obtain the same conclusion.

To estimate (II) in (2.12), we use Lemma 4 with $k = 1$ and to show the interchanging of ζ and z is benign. In then follows by the same argument as for (I), we obtain $(II) \leq \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}$. Therefore, the estimate in Seting 1 is complete.

Setting 2: Ω is defined by (1.3)**.** We omit the proof because it is analogous to Setting 1 with Lemma 5 replacing Lemma 4. For details, see Section 3.2 in [HKR14].

Part II: Proof of $\|u\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)}$. The proof of this part is similar to, but simpler than, the argument for Part III, so we omit it.

Part III: Proof of $\|u\|_{\Lambda^f(b\Omega)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)}$. We need a general Hardy-Littwood type lemma to prove f-Hölder estimates on the boundary.

Lemma 6. *Let Ω be a bounded Lipschitz domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and let $G : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}^+$ be an increasing function such that $\dfrac{G(t)}{t}$ is decreasing and $\displaystyle\int_0^s \frac{G(t)}{t} dt < \infty$ for $s > 0$ small enough. If $v \in C^1(\mathbb{C}^n \setminus b\Omega)$ such that*

$$|\nabla v(x \pm s\nu(x))| \lesssim \frac{G(s)}{s} \quad \text{for any } x \in b\Omega. \tag{2.16}$$

Then $v \in \Lambda^f(b\Omega)$ where $f(s^{-1}) = \Big(\displaystyle\int_0^s \frac{G(t)}{t} dt\Big)^{-1}$.

The proof is basically identical to the corresponding result for domains. See [Kha13, Theorem 5.1]) for details. Consequently, the focus is now to control the gradient of H^+ and H^-.

Lemma 7. *For $z \in b\Omega$, we have*

(1) $\sup_{z \in b\Omega_s} |\nabla H^+\phi(z)| \lesssim \frac{G(s)}{s}\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)}$, *and*
(2) $\sup_{z \in b\Omega^s} |\nabla H^-\phi(z)| \lesssim \frac{G(s)}{s}\|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)}$

where $G(s) = \sup_{p \in b\Omega}\{\sqrt{F_p^*(s)}\}$ if Ω is defined by (1.2) *and $G(s) = \sup_{p \in b\Omega}\{\sqrt{F_p^*(s)}|\log\sqrt{F_p^*(s)}|\}$ if Ω is defined by* (1.3).

Proof. Khanh has already proved (1) [Kha13]. For the proof of (2), direct calculations show

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla H^- \phi(z)| \lesssim & \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)} \int_{b\Omega} \left(\frac{1}{|\Phi(z,\zeta)||z-\zeta|^2} + \frac{1}{|\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2|z-\zeta|} \right) dS(\zeta) \\ \lesssim & \|\phi\|_{L^\infty(b\Omega)} \int_{b\Omega} \frac{dS(\zeta)}{|\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2|z-\zeta|}\end{aligned}$$

for $z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$ near $\bar{\Omega}$. We choose a covering $\{B(p_j,\delta)\}_{j=1}^N$ of $b\Omega$ and change coordinates to set p_j to 0 as in the proof of Theorem 2; thus our proof reduces to showing

$$L(z) := \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)} \frac{dS}{|\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2|z-\zeta|} \lesssim \frac{G(\rho(z))}{\rho(z)}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}^n \setminus \bar{\Omega}.$$

For Setting 1, we use Lemma 4 with $k=2$ to interchange the roles of ζ and z. We then estimate

$$L(z) \lesssim \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta) \text{ and } |z_1| \geq |z_1-\zeta_1|} \cdots + \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta) \text{ and } |z_1| \leq |z_1-\zeta_1|} \cdots \lesssim (D) + (E),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}(D) &= \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)} \frac{dS}{(\rho(z)^2 + |\operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2 + F^2(|z_1-\zeta_1|^2))\,|z_1-\zeta_1|}, \\ (E) &= \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)} \frac{dS}{\left(\rho(z)^2 + |\operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2 + F^2(\frac{1}{2}|\zeta_1|^2)\right)|\zeta_1| + \left(\rho(z)^2 + |\operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2 + F^2(\frac{1}{2}|z_1|^2)\right)|z_1|}.\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

For the integral (D), if $|z_1-\zeta_1| \geq \delta$ then $(D) \lesssim (F^2(\delta^2)\delta)^{-1}$; otherwise we make the change of variable $(w,t) = (z_1-\zeta_1, \operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta))$. We can check that the Jacobian of this tranformation is nonzero on the domain of integration δ is chosen sufficiently small. Thus,

$$(D) \lesssim (F^2(\delta^2)\delta)^{-1} + \int_{|w|\leq 2\delta} \frac{dw}{(|\rho(z)| + F(|w|^2))|w|} \leq C_\delta \frac{\sqrt{F^*(|\rho(z)|)}}{|\rho(z)|}$$

where the last inequality follows by Lemma 3.2 in [Kha13].

For the integral (E), if $|z_1| \geq \delta$ then $(E) \lesssim (F^2(\frac{1}{2}\delta^2)\delta)^{-1}$; otherwise

$$(E) \lesssim \int_{\zeta \in b\Omega \cap B(0,\delta)} \frac{dS}{\left(\rho(z)^2 + |\operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta)|^2 + F^2(\frac{1}{2}|\zeta_1|^2)\right)|\zeta_1|}.$$

In this case, we make the change variable $(w,t) = (\zeta_1, \operatorname{Im}\Phi(z,\zeta))$. The Jacobian of this transformation is also different zero on the domain of integration if δ is small. We thus obtain the desired estimate for (E).

The proof for the real case follows by the same argument using Lemma 5 and Lemma 4.1 in [Kha13]. This is complete the proof of Lemma 7. □

Lemma 7 allows us to apply Lemma 6 to $H^+\phi$ and $H^-\phi$ and establish that $H^+\phi, H^-\phi \in \Lambda^f(b\Omega)$. We may now conclude that $u \in \Lambda^f(b\Omega)$. □

2.2. **Proof of Theorem 2.**

Proof of Theorem 2. Let $\phi = \sum_{j=1}^2 \phi_j\, d\bar{z}_j$ be a bounded, $\mathcal{C}^1$, $\bar{\partial}$-closed $(0,1)$-form on $\bar{\Omega}$. The solution u of the $\bar{\partial}$-equation, $\bar{\partial}u = \phi$, provided by the Henkin kernel is given by

$$u = T\phi(z) = H\phi(z) + K\phi(z). \tag{2.18}$$

where $H\phi = \int_{\zeta\in b\Omega} H(\zeta,z)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta)$ and

$$K\phi(z) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2}\int_\Omega \frac{\phi_1(\zeta)(\bar{\zeta_1}-\bar{z}_1)-\phi_2(\zeta)(\bar{\zeta_2}-\bar{z}_2)}{|\zeta-z|^4}\omega(\bar{\zeta})\wedge\omega(\zeta) \tag{2.19}$$

As mentioned in Section 1, the smoothness of u is a consequence of Theorem 3 in [Ran92]. In particular, Range proved

$$\|T\phi\|_{\Lambda_s(\Omega)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{\Lambda_s(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } \phi \text{ with } \bar\partial\phi = 0 \text{ and all } s>0$$

holds on any bounded convex domain Ω in $\mathbb{C}^2$ with smooth boundary. Here $\Lambda_s(\Omega)$ is the Hölder space of order s. Thus the proof of Theorem 2 will be complete if we prove

$$\|T\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \lesssim \|\phi\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \tag{2.20}$$

on our setting of Ω. For $z\in b\Omega$ and $\bar\partial\phi = 0$ in Ω, Shaw [Sha89, pages 412-414] showed that

$$K\phi(z) = -\int_{\zeta\in b\Omega} H(z,\zeta)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta).$$

Although Shaw uses the signed distance to the boundary defining function, her argument is essentially formal and holds for any C^1 defining function. Thus we have

$$\forall z\in b\Omega,\quad u(z) = \int_{\zeta\in b\Omega}\left(H(\zeta,z)-H(z,\zeta)\right)\phi(\zeta)\wedge\omega(\zeta).$$

By the same argument to Part I in Section 2, (2.20) is obtained.

□

3. Proof of Theorem 1

The next two lemmas are modified versions of Lemmas 4.3 and 4.8 in [Sha91].

Lemma 8. *Suppose that Ω is convex and contains the origin. Let α be a positive, d-closed, smooth $(1,1)$-form on $\bar\Omega$ supported on $\bar\Omega\setminus\overline{B(0,r)}$ for some $r>0$. This means*

$$\alpha = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2}\alpha_{j\bar k}\,dz_j\wedge d\bar z_k$$

where $\alpha_{j\bar k}\in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ and $\alpha_{j\bar k}\equiv 0$ on $B(0,r)$. Then there exists a $(0,1)$-form f on $\bar\Omega$ so that

(1) $\bar\partial f = 0$;
(2) $\partial f - \bar\partial\bar f = \alpha$;
(3) There exists $c = c(\Omega,r)$ such that

$$\|f\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} + \|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le c\|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Following Rudin [Rud80, Theorem 17.2.7], we let $f(z) = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k(z)\,d\bar z_k$ where

$$f_k(z) = \sum_{j=1}^n z_j\int_0^1 t\alpha_{j\bar k}(tz)\,dt.$$

With this choice of f, it follows that both $\partial f - \bar\partial\bar f = \alpha$ and $\bar\partial f = 0$.

Since $\|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \|\alpha_{j\bar{k}}\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$, it follows easily that with induced surface area measure $d\sigma$,

$$\int_{b\Omega} |f(z)|\, d\sigma(z) \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_{b\Omega} |z_j| \int_0^1 |t\alpha_{j\bar{k}}(zt)|\, dt\, d\sigma(z) \leq \frac{c}{r^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_{b\Omega} \int_0^1 t^3 |\alpha_{j\bar{k}}(zt)|\, dt\, d\sigma(z)$$
$$\leq \frac{c}{r^2} \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_\Omega |\alpha_{j\bar{k}}(z)|\, dV(z) = \frac{c}{r^2} \|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)},$$

where dV is Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}^2$ and c may change from line to line (and also depends on $\operatorname{dist}(b\Omega, 0)$). Additionally, a similar argument also shows $\|f\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \leq c\|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$. In particular, with the change of variables $s = t\tau$,

$$\int_\Omega |f(z)|\, dV(z) = \int_0^1 \int_{b\Omega} |f(\tau z)|\, d\sigma(z)\, \tau^3 d\tau \leq \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_0^1 \int_{b\Omega} \Big| \int_0^1 t\tau z_j \alpha_{j\bar{k}}(t\tau z)\, dt \Big| d\sigma(z)\, \tau^3 d\tau$$
$$\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_0^1 \int_{b\Omega} \int_0^\tau \big| s z_j \alpha_{j\bar{k}}(sz) \big|\, ds\, d\sigma(z)\, \tau^2 d\tau$$
$$\leq \sum_{j,k=1}^2 \int_{b\Omega} \int_0^1 \big| s z_j \alpha_{j\bar{k}}(sz) \big|\, ds\, d\sigma(z) \leq \frac{c}{r^2} \|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$$

□

Remark 2. In [Sha91], Shaw requires that α is positive, i.e., $(\alpha_{j\bar{k}})$ is a positive definite matrix. In this case, basic linear algebra shows that $2|\alpha_{j\bar{k}}| \leq \alpha_{j\bar{j}} + \alpha_{k\bar{k}}$. She then estimates the integral only on the diagonal of α. Implicit in her computation is Lelong's computation that positive $(1,1)$ currents α must satisfy $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$ and $\alpha_{j\bar{k}} = -\alpha_{k\bar{j}}$. In contrast, we solve the Poincare-Lelong equation for general data with no assumption of positivity. However, our application to the Nevanlinna class argument only involves positive data.

Lemma 9. *Suppose that Ω is convex and contains the origin. Let α be a d-closed, smooth $(1,1)$-form on $\bar{\Omega}$ supported on $\bar{\Omega} \setminus \overline{B(0,r)}$ for some $r > 0$. Then there exists a real-valued function $u \in C^\infty(\bar{\Omega})$ so that*

(1) $i\partial\bar{\partial} u = \alpha$;
(2) $\|u\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \leq c\|\alpha\|_{L^1(\Omega)}$ for some constant $c = c(r, \Omega) > 0$ that is independent of α and u.

Proof. We use Lemma 8 to establish the existence of a $\bar{\partial}$-closed $(0,1)$-form f that satisfies $\partial f - \bar{\partial}\bar{f} = \alpha$ and (3.1). Since f is $\bar{\partial}$-closed and in $L^1(b\Omega)$, we can use Theorem 2 to establish a function v so that $i\bar{\partial} v = f$ and satisfies (1.9). Note then that

$$\alpha = i\partial\bar{\partial} v - i\bar{\partial}\partial\bar{v} = i\partial\bar{\partial}(v + \bar{v}).$$

It now follows that $u = v + \bar{v}$ is the desired function. □

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. The second Cousin problem can be solved on convex domains, so there exists $h \in H(\Omega)$ with zero set $\hat{X}$. Extend h to $\mathbb{C}^2$ by setting $h(z) \equiv 1$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \Omega$. Let $\alpha = \alpha_{\hat{X}}$ be the positive $(1,1)$-current on $\mathbb{C}^2$ defined by $\alpha = i\partial\bar{\partial} \log|h|$. Observe that $\alpha \equiv 0$ off of $\bar{\Omega}$. Let $\varphi_\epsilon \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ be an approximation of the identity, in particular, let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R})$, $\operatorname{supp}\varphi \subset (-1/2, 1/2)$, $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \varphi\, dx = 1$, and $\varphi_\epsilon(x) = \epsilon^{-1}\varphi(x/\epsilon)$. Let $\Omega_\epsilon = \{z \in \Omega : \rho(z) < -\epsilon\}$.

Define $v_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\mathbb{C}^2)$ by

$$v_\epsilon(z) = \int_{\mathbb{C}^2} \log|h(w)|\varphi_\epsilon(|z-w|)\,dV(w).$$

Then $v_\epsilon(z) \to \log|h(z)|$ for almost all $z \in \Omega$. By the Poincaré-Lelong formula [NO90, Theorem 5.1.13], $\alpha = 0$ on $\{z : h(z) \neq 0\}$, an open set. Therefore, there exists $p \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ for which $\alpha|_{B(p,2r)} \equiv 0$.

Set $\alpha_\epsilon = i\partial\bar\partial v_\epsilon$. Then $\alpha_\epsilon \in C^\infty_{1,1}(\bar\Omega)$. Since $d\partial\bar\partial = 0$, α_ϵ is d-closed. Note that if $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough, $\varphi_\epsilon|_{B(p,r)} \equiv 0$. Therefore, by translating $p \mapsto 0$, we can apply Lemma 9 to α_ϵ (which we shall do without any further comment regarding the support of α of α_ϵ). Also, α is positive, so α_ϵ is as well (on Ω_ϵ) [NO90, Lemma 3.2.13], and we write

$$\alpha_\epsilon = \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \alpha^\epsilon_{jk}\,dz_j \wedge d\bar z_k.$$

Recall that convolution of a distribution with a test function behaves as follows: $\langle T * \varphi, \psi\rangle = \langle T, \tilde\varphi * \psi\rangle$ where $\tilde\varphi(x) = \varphi(-x)$. This means

$$\|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} = \sup_{g,\ \|g\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \int_\Omega \alpha_\epsilon \wedge g\,dV.$$

Each integral in the wedge product is an integral of the $\langle\beta_\epsilon, \psi\rangle$ where $\beta_\epsilon = \beta * \varphi$ where β is a (positive on Ω_ϵ)) Radon measure built from the components of α. All of this means

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\beta_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} &= \sup_{\psi,\ \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \langle \beta * \varphi_\epsilon, \psi\rangle = \sup_{\psi,\ \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \langle \beta, \tilde\varphi_\epsilon * \psi\rangle \\
&= \sup_{\psi,\ \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \int_\Omega \tilde\varphi_\epsilon * \psi\,d\beta \le \sup_{\psi,\ \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \varphi_\epsilon(x-y)\psi(y)\,dy\,d\beta(x) \\
&\le \sup_{\psi,\ \|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\le 1} \beta(\Omega)\|\psi\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \beta(\Omega).
\end{aligned}$$

The upshot of this calculation is that because h exactly has $\hat X$ as its zero divisor, the finite area of $\hat X$ guarantees the existence of a constant $A > 0$ so that $\|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le A$ where the constant A is independent of ϵ.

Next, each v_ϵ is d-closed on Ω, so we may invoke Lemma 9 to establish the existence of a real-valued $u_\epsilon \in C^\infty(\bar\Omega)$ that satisfies $i\partial\bar\partial u_\epsilon = \alpha_\epsilon$ on Ω and

$$\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^1(b\Omega)} \le c\|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)} \le cA.$$

Set $g_\epsilon = u_\epsilon - v_\epsilon$. Then g_ϵ is a smooth function on $\bar\Omega$ and pluriharmonic on Ω since $i\partial\bar\partial u_\epsilon = \alpha_\epsilon = i\partial\bar\partial v_\epsilon$. Moreover, for small $\epsilon > 0$, Lemma 10 proves that $\{g_\epsilon\}$ is a normal family of pluriharmonic functions on Ω and therefore there exists a subsequence $\epsilon_k \to 0$ and a pluriharmonic function g so that $g_{\epsilon_k} \to g$ uniformly on compact subsets of Ω.

Since g is pluriharmonic on Ω, there exists $H \in H(\Omega)$ so that $g = \operatorname{Re} H$. By construction (and the uniform convergence on compacta), $i\partial\bar\partial g = 0$. Define

$$U(z) = \log|h(z)| + g(z) = \log|e^{H(z)}h(z)|.$$

The proof is complete once we show that

$$\int_{b\Omega_s} |U(z)|\,d\sigma_{b\Omega_s} \le C$$

for some $C > 0$ and all $s > 0$ but this follows by the argument leading to [Gru75, (6)]. □

Lemma 10. *For $\epsilon > 0$ small, the set of pluriharmonic functions $\{g_\epsilon\}$ from the proof of Theorem 1 comprises a normal family. Specifically, there exists $C > 0$ so that if $U \subset\subset \Omega$, then there exists $C = C(U)$ that does not depend on ϵ so that $|g_{\epsilon,s}(z)| \leq C$.*

Proof. Plurisubharmonic functions are in $L^1_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$ so $v_\epsilon = \log|h| * \varphi_\epsilon$ satisfies the following inequality: for $K \subset \Omega$ compact, there exists $C_K > 0$ so that for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^1(K)} \leq C_K.$$

Following Gruman [Gru75], we let $U \subset \Omega$ have compact closure in Ω. Let $\eta \in C_c^\infty(\Omega)$ so that $0 \leq \eta \leq 1$ and $\eta \equiv 1$ on a neighborhood of $\bar{U}$. Then for $z \in U$,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_\epsilon(z) &= \frac{2}{(2\pi)^2}\int_\Omega \frac{1}{|z-w|^2}\triangle\big(\eta v_\epsilon(w)\big)\,dV(w) \\
&= \frac{2}{2\pi}\int_\Omega \frac{\eta(w)}{|z-w|^2}\triangle v_\epsilon(w) + \frac{v_\epsilon(w)}{|z-w|^2}\triangle\eta(w) + \frac{1}{|z-w|^2}\Big(\nabla_w\eta\cdot\nabla_{\bar{w}}v_\epsilon + \nabla_{\bar{w}}\eta\cdot\nabla_w v_\epsilon\Big)dV(w) \\
&= \frac{2}{2\pi}\int_\Omega \frac{\eta(w)}{|z-w|^2}\triangle v_\epsilon(w)\,dV(w) + \frac{2}{2\pi}\int_\Omega v_\epsilon(w)\bigg(\frac{\triangle\eta(w)}{|z-w|^2} - \nabla_{\bar{w}}\cdot\Big[\frac{\nabla_w\eta}{|z-w|^2}\Big] + \nabla_w\Big[\frac{\nabla_{\bar{w}}\eta}{|z-w|^2}\Big]\bigg)\,dV(w)
\end{aligned}$$

The second integral is bounded by $C_\eta\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\operatorname{supp}\eta)}$ since $|w-z|$ is bounded away from 0 since $\operatorname{supp}\nabla\eta$ is a positive distance away from $\bar{U}$. For the first integral, if ϵ is small enough, then $K = \{\xi : \xi \in \operatorname{supp}\varphi_\epsilon(w-\cdot) \text{ for any } w \in \bar{U}\}$ is a compact set in Ω. This means

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\int_\Omega \frac{\eta(w)}{|z-w|^2}\triangle v_\epsilon(w)\,dV(w)\Big| &= \int_\Omega\int_\Omega \frac{\eta(w)}{|z-w|^2}\varphi_\epsilon(w-\xi)\,d\alpha(\xi)\,dV(w) \\
&\leq \int_K |\log|h(\xi)||\int_\Omega \varphi_\epsilon(w-\xi)\eta(w)\frac{1}{|z-w|^2}\,dV(w)\,d\alpha(\xi) \\
&\leq C\alpha(\Omega) < \infty
\end{aligned}$$

since $\hat{X}$ has finite area. We therefore obtain the bound

$$\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} \leq C_\eta$$

where C_η does not depend on $\epsilon > 0$ (assuming that $\epsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small). The functions g_ϵ are pluriharmonic, so by the Poisson Integral Formula,

$$g_\epsilon(z) = \int_{b\Omega} P(z,w)g_\epsilon(w)\,d\sigma(w) = \int_{b\Omega} P(z,w)\big(u_\epsilon(w) + v_\epsilon(w)\big)\,d\sigma(w).$$

Since $u_\epsilon \in L^1(b\Omega)$ and $z \in U$ so that $|z-w|$ is bounded away from 0,

$$\Big|\int_{b\Omega} P(z,w)u_\epsilon(w)\,d\sigma(w)\Big| \leq C_U\|u_\epsilon\|_{L^1(b\Omega)}.$$

Also, recall that for each fixed $z \in \Omega$, $P(z,w) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\nu_w}G(z,w)$ where $G(z,w)$ is the Green's function for Ω, and $G(z,w) = 0$ for all $y \in b\Omega$. By Green's formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{b\Omega} P(z,w)v_\epsilon(w)\,d\sigma(w) &= -\int_{b\Omega}\frac{\partial G(z,w)}{\partial\nu_w}v_\epsilon(w)\,d\sigma(w) \\
&= \int_\Omega v_\epsilon(w)\triangle G(z,w)\,dV(w) - \int_\Omega G(z,w)\triangle v_\epsilon(w)\,dV(w).
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $G(z,w)$ is integrable on Ω in z and in w. Indeed, $G(z,w)$ blows up like the Newtonian potential (i.e., integrably) and is symmetric in its arguments. Consequently, by Folland [Fol99, Theorem 6.18], for $z \in U$, there exists $C = C(U) > 0$ so that

$$\Big|\int_{b\Omega} P(z,w)v_\epsilon(w)\,d\sigma(w)\Big| \leq C\big(\|v_\epsilon\|_{L^\infty(U)} + \|\alpha_\epsilon\|_{L^1(\Omega)}\big).$$

□

References

[AC02] H. Ahn and H.R. Cho. Zero sets of holomorphic functions in the Nevanlinna type class on convex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$. *Japan. J. Math. (N.S.)*, 28(2):245–260, 2002.

[Ale05] W. Alexandre. C^k-estimates for the $\overline{\partial}_b$-equation on convex domains of finite type. *Michigan Math. J.*, 53(2):357–382, 2005.

[BC82] A. Bonami and P. Charpentier. Solutions de l'équation $\overline{\partial}$ et zéros de la classe de Nevanlinna dans certains domaines faiblement pseudo-convexes. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 32(4):53–89 (1983), 1982.

[BCD98] J. Bruna, P. Charpentier, and Y. Dupain. Zero varieties for the Nevanlinna class in convex domains of finite type in $\mathbf{C}^n$. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 147(2):391–415, 1998.

[CDM14] P. Charpentier, Y. Dupain, and M. Mounkaila. Estimates for solutions of the $\bar{\partial}$-equation and application to the characterization of the zero varieties of the functions of the Nevanlinna class for lineally convex domains of finite type. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 24(4):1860–1881, 2014.

[Chr88] M. Christ. Regularity properties of the $\overline{\partial}_b$ equation on weakly pseudoconvex CR manifolds of dimension 3. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 1:587–646, 1988.

[CNS92] D.-C. Chang, A. Nagel, and E.M. Stein. Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-Neumann problem in pseudoconvex domains of finite type in $\mathbb{C}^2$. *Acta Math.*, 169:153–228, 1992.

[Cum01] A. Cumenge. Zero sets of functions in the Nevanlinna or the Nevanlinna-Djrbachian classes. *Pacific J. Math.*, 199(1):79–92, 2001.

[DM01] K. Diederich and E. Mazzilli. Zero varieties for the Nevanlinna class on all convex domains of finite type. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 163(215–227), 2001.

[FK88] C. Fefferman and J.J. Kohn. Hölder estimates on domains of complex dimension two and on three dimensional CR manifolds. *Adv. in Math.*, 69:233–303, 1988.

[FKM90] C. Fefferman, J.J. Kohn, and M. Machedon. Hölder estimates on CR manifolds with a diagonalizable Levi form. *Adv. in Math.*, 84:1–90, 1990.

[FLZ11] J.E. Fornæss, L. Lee, and Y. Zhang. On supnorm estimates for $\overline{\partial}$ on infinite type convex domains in $\mathbb{C}^2$. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 21(3):495–512, 2011.

[Fol99] G. B. Folland. *Real Analysis : Modern techniques and their applications*. Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York). John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, Second edition, 1999.

[FS74] G.B. Folland and E.M. Stein. Estimates for the $\bar{\partial}_b$-complex and analysis on the Heisenberg group. *Comm. Pure and Appl. Math.*, 27:429–522, 1974.

[Gru75] L. Gruman. The zeros of holomorphic functions in strictly pseudoconvex domains. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 207(163–174), 1975.

[Hen77a] G.M. Henkin. Lewy's equation and analysis on pseudoconvex manifolds, I. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 32:59–130, 1977.

[Hen77b] G.M. Henkin. Lewy's equation and analysis on pseudoconvex manifolds, II. *Math. USSR-Sb.*, 102:63–64, 1977.

[HKR14] K.L. Ha, T.V. Khanh, and A. Raich. L^p-estimates for the $\bar{\partial}$-equation on a class of infinite type domains. *Internat. J. Math.*, 25(11):1450106 (15 pages), 2014. DOI: 10.1142/S0129167X14501067.

[Kha13] T. Khanh. Supnorm and f-Hölder estimates for $\bar{\partial}$ on convex domains of general type in $\mathbb{C}^2$. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 403(2):522–531, 2013.

[Koe02] K. Koenig. On maximal Sobolev and Hölder estimates for the tangential Cauchy-Riemann operator and boundary Laplacian. *Amer. J. Math*, 124:129–197, 2002.

[LTS05] C. Laurent-Thiébaut and M.-C. Shaw. Boundary Hölder and L^p estimates for local solutions of the tangential Cauchy-Riemann equation. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 257(1):151–177, 2005.

[NO90] J. Noguchi and T. Ochiai. *Geometric function theory in several complex variables*, volume 80 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1990. Translated from the Japanese by Noguchi.

[NS06] A. Nagel and E.M. Stein. The $\bar{\partial}_b$-complex on decoupled domains in $\mathbb{C}^n$, $n \geq 3$. *Ann. of Math.*, 164:649–713, 2006.

[Ran86] M. Range. *Holomorphic functions and integral representations in several complex variables*, volume 108 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[Ran92] M. Range. On Hölder and BMO estimates for $\overline{\partial}$ on convex domains in $\mathbf{C^2}$. *J. Geom. Anal.*, 2(6):575–584, 1992.

[Rud80] W. Rudin. *Function theory in the unit ball of* $\mathbf{C}^n$, volume 241 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Science]*. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1980.

[Sha89] M.-C. Shaw. Prescribing zeros of functions in the Nevanlinna class on weakly pseudo-convex domains in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 313(1):407–418, 1989.

[Sha91] M.-C. Shaw. Optimal Hölder and L^p estimates for $\overline{\partial}_b$ on the boundaries of real ellipsoids in $\mathbf{C}^n$. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 324(1):213–234, 1991.

[Sko76] H. Skoda. Valeurs au bord pour les solutions de l'opérator d'', et caractérisation des zers des fonctions de la classe de nevanlinna. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 104:225–299, 1976.

[Var80] N. Varopoulos. Zeros of H^p functions in several complex variables. *Pacific J. Math.*, 88(1):189–246, 1980.

[Wu98] D. Wu. Sobolev and Hölder estimates for $\overline{\partial}$ on bounded convex domains in $\mathbf{C}^2$. *Illinois J. Math.*, 42(3):371–388, 1998.

T.V. Khanh

School of Mathematics and Applied Statistics, University of Wollongong, NSW, Australia, 2522
E-mail address: tkhanh@uow.edu.au

A. Raich

Department of Mathematical Sciences, SCEN 327, 1 University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701
E-mail address: araich@uark.edu